REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 12-19 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dunn et al. (U.S. 6,018,383); Claims 3-11, 20-29, 40-43 and 47-52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. in view of Yager et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0029969).

Amended Claims

The original Claims 1-29, 40-43 and 46-52 are cancelled and new Claims 53-92 are submitted to replace the original claims. The claims have been rewritten for clarity and proper antecedent bases. No new matter has been added.

New Claims 53-71 are supported by the disclosure on pages 31-35, Figures 5-8 and the original claims. New Claims 72-92 are supported by the disclosure on pages 35-41, Figures 9 and 10 and the original claims. More specifically:

Claim 53 is supported by original Claim 1, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 54 is supported by original Claim 2, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 55 is supported by original Claim 3, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 56 is supported by original Claim 9, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 57 is supported by original Claim 10, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 58 is supported by original Claim 11, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 59 is supported by original Claim 12, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 60 is supported by original Claim 13, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 61 is supported by original Claim 14, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 62 is supported by original Claim 15, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 63 is supported by original Claim 17, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 64 is supported by original Claim 16, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 65 is supported by original Claim 16, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 66 is supported by original Claim 19, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 67 is supported by original Claim 20, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 68 is supported by original Claim 21, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 69 is supported by original Claim 22, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 70 is supported by original Claim 40, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 71 is supported by original Claim 42, pages 31-35 and Figure 8.

Claim 72 is supported by original Claim 4, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 73 is supported by original Claim 4, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 74 is supported by original Claim 5, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 75 is supported by original Claim 6, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 76 is supported by original Claim 6, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 77 is supported by original Claim 7, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 78 is supported by original Claim 7, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 79 is supported by original Claim 8, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 80 is supported by original Claims 23 and 24, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 81 is supported by original Claim 25, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 82 is supported by original Claim 26, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 83 is supported by original Claim 26, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 84 is supported by original Claim 27, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 85 is supported by original Claim 27, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 86 is supported by original Claim 28, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 87 is supported by original Claim 29, pages 31-41 and Figure 10.

Claim 88 is supported by original Claims 46-48.

Claim 89 is supported by original Claim 49.

Claim 90 is supported by original Claim 50.

Claim 91 is supported by original Claim 51.

Claim 92 is supported by original Claim 52.

Rejection of Original Claims 1, 2, 12-19 and 46

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, 12-19 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dunn et al. (U.S. 6,018,383).

Original independent Claims 1 and 12 are now independent Claims 53 and 59 respectively.

Original independent Claim 46 has been cancelled.

Before commenting on Dunn et al., Applicants wish to point out that the present invention relates to a continuous and synchronized process for the preparation of well-defined structures or microcups useful in an electrophoretic or liquid crystal display and a

continuous and synchronized process for the preparation of a multi-color electrophoretic or liquid crystal display.

The process of Dunn et al. is different from the process of independent Claims 53 or 59 in many aspects. For example, Dunn et al. only mentions projection of a master pattern imprinted on a flexible material onto another substrate. Dunn et al. does not disclose exposing/curing a radiation curable material followed by removing unexposed radiation curable material. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully disagree with Examiner's assessment that Dunn et al. is relevant under Section 102(e) as concerns the original Claims 1, 2 and 12-19 (now Claims 53 and 59 and claims dependent therefrom).

Rejection of Original Claims 3-11, 20-29, 40-43 and 47-52

The Examiner rejected Claims 3-11, 20-29, 40-43 and 47-52 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunn et al. in view of Yager et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0029969).

New Claims 55, 67, 72 and 80 are the independent claims corresponding to the rejected claims.

Yager et al. in fact discloses a microelectrophoresis chip for moving and separating nucleic acids and other charged biomolecules (see [0001]). The paragraphs cited by the Examiner in the office action only relate to, for example, how charged biomolecules move or migrate under an electric field, the configuration and construction of a separation matrix for the biomolecules, the preparation of patterned microelectrodes and connecting wires for the microelectrophoresis chip, a protective layer for preventing evaporation of a biomolecule sample and loading of a biomolecule sample.

The present invention, as stated earlier, relates to a continuous and synchronized process for the preparation of well-defined structures or microcups useful in an electrophoretic or liquid crystal display and a continuous and synchronized process for the preparation of a multi-color electrophoretic or liquid crystal display.

According to MPEP (2141.01(a)), "in order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." Yager et al. clearly is not in the field of Applicants' endeavor.

Furthermore, Yager et al. is also not in any way reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which Applicants were concerned. Paragraph [0038] of Yager et al. discusses formation of separation channels for the charged biomolecules by casting a substrate in a mold. The mold, according to paragraphs [0039]-[0041], is prepared by coating pattern receiving layers on a tungsten substrate, exposure and development of a resist, and followed by transferring a pattern formed down through the layers coated on the substrate using successive treatments with specific chemical etchants, culminating in the etching of the substrate itself. The process bears no resemblance to the processes or any part or parts of the processes, of the present invention. Yager et al. also does not suggest a continuous or synchronized process.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that the present invention is patentable and respectfully request reconsideration of the claims attached herewith.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 18, 2003 By: _____
Stacy Ann Hegle, Reg. No. 50,687

Heller Ehrman White & McAuliffe LLP
275 Middlefield Road
Menlo Park, California 94025-3506
Direct Dial: (650) 833-7385
Telephone: (650) 324-7000
Facsimile: (650) 324-0638

SV 450809 v1
8/18/03 2:21 PM (26822.0006)